

October 28, 2004
Case No.: AUS920010927US1 (9000/82)
Serial No.: 10/042,494
Filed: January 9, 2002
Page 5 of 7

-- REMARKS --

Claims 1-12 are under consideration. No new matter has been added with the addition of claim 12 or the amendment to the specification. Applicant thanks Examiner Bullock for his courtesies in the telephonic interview of October 19, 2004, but regret that the interview was not successful in reaching agreement.

A. The Examiner rejected claims 1-11 as anticipated by *Jordan*

The rejection of claims 1-11 as anticipated under 35 U.S.C §102(b) over *Jordan* is traversed. In order to maintain this §102(b) rejection, each and every element of the claimed invention must be disclosed in as great detail by the reference. Because the reference does not disclose each and every element, this rejection must fall.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of Calif.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1989). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as in contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

As discussed with the Examiner during the interview, a command environment is defined by a command language, with its underlying data. In general, a command environment supports a number of commands which, once issued, perform non-interactively, and which, when finished, leave the old command environment in control. As noted by United States Patent Publication 2003/0131340, in many programming applications it often becomes necessary to invoke an external command to perform a specific task. Most languages such as C, C++, and Java provide an API to launch an external command. A user may choose to either use the existing command environment established when launching the application or may create a specific restricted environment for the external command. However, the API does not provide a means to "add-to" the existing command environment.

October 28, 2004

Case No.: AUS920010927US1 (9000/82)

Serial No.: 10/042,494

Filed: January 9, 2002

Page 6 of 7

as noted in the specification, passing a parameter from an application to an external command may present technical difficulties. See specification, page 1, lines 21-29.

At a minimum, *Jordan* does not disclose storing the command environment as an array of strings and invoking the customized command environment with the added parameters, as recited in the independent claims. *Jordan* does disclose creating a macro, and then invoking the macro using a macro editor. However, a macro and a customized command environment are not identical. A macro is a single, user-defined command that is *part of an* application and executes a series of commands. See, definition of "macro" at dictionary.com (emphasis added). In contrast, a customized command environment receives parameters *passed from* an application. See, specification at page 3, lines 17-25 (emphasis added). While a macro may be run to configure a command environment, the claim requires storing a command environment as an array of strings and also invoking the customized command environment with the added parameters.

Therefore, claims 1, 5, and 9 are patentable over *Jordan*, as are claims 2-4, 6-8, and 10-12 depending from claim 1, 5, or 9, respectively.

Furthermore, claims 4, 8 and 12 require that the parameter be selected from a group consisting of standard characters, special characters, and embedded spaces. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, *Jordan* does not disclose these elements. Indeed, the words "standard characters," "special characters," and "embedded spaces" do not even appear in *Jordan*. As the Examiner does not cite to any particular portion of *Jordan*, which is 122 pages long, the Examiner has failed his duty to provide support for his rejection. Withdrawal of the rejections to claims 4, 8 and 12 is requested for at least this additional reason.

Newly added claim 12 is patentable over the references, as the references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest each and every element of claim 12.

October 28, 2004
Case No.: AUS920010927US1 (9000/82)
Serial No.: 10/042,494
Filed: January 9, 2002
Page 7 of 7


CONCLUSION

The Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-12 fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested.

Dated: October 28, 2004

Respectfully submitted,
JAMES M. MCARDLE

CARDINAL LAW GROUP
Suite 2000
1603 Orrington Avenue
Evanston, Illinois 60201
Phone: (847) 905-7111
Fax: (847) 905-7113



Frank C. Nicholas
Registration No. 33,983
Attorney for Applicants